

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the present application in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 13-30, 39-50, and 55-60 were previously withdrawn while reserving the right to pursue the previously recited subject matter in subsequent continuation or divisional applications.
- Claims 32 and 33 were previously canceled and Claims 13-30, 39-50, and 55-60 are canceled herein without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein.
- Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11, 31, 35-37, 51, and 53 are amended herein.
- Claims 1-12, 31, 34-38, and 51-54 remain pending for consideration.

Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 5, 9, 31, 35, and 51 is found in the specification, as originally filed, in at least paragraphs [0029] and [0030]. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 11, 36, 37, and 53 are hereby amended to correct minor informalities. No new matter is being introduced thereby.

Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the present Application:

- **Davis:** Davis, U.S. Patent No. 5,576,755
- **Nunberg:** Nunberg, U.S. Patent No. 5,111,398

Claims 1-12, 31, 34-38, and 51-54 are Non-Obvious over Davis in view of Nunberg

Claims 1-12, 31, 34-38, and 51-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Davis in view of Nunberg. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 31, 35, and 51 in the manner set forth above.

Independent Claim 1

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Davis and Nunberg neither teaches nor suggests at least the following features recited in independent Claim 1:

compressing electronic program guide (EPG) data using:

a character compression technique that generates a compression table by examining the EPG data to recognize common sets of characters, the compression table being used to assign a plurality of character encoding values to represent each common set of characters;

a word compression technique that analyzes the EPG data to create a word table that includes words having a predetermined number of letters, wherein words having the predetermined number of letters are represented by a plurality of word encoding values; and

spacing and capitalization rules to reduce a number of character encoding values in the EPG data in which one of the spacing rules includes removing character encoding values that identify spaces in the compressed EPG data, and one of the capitalization rules includes limiting a number of character encoding values such that separate encoding values are not needed to represent capital letters;

Applicant respectfully notes that independent Claim 1 is hereby amended to recite the foregoing features.

Applicant submits that Davis “provides for automated checking of the program listings data in a database of television program schedule listings used in an electronic program guide (‘EPG’)” (Abstract). Davis describes that a “verification system may be used to check the entire database or a user-defined subset of the database for one or more of the following: missing stations, schedule gaps and overlaps, missing titles, missing copy, missing fields, missing movie ratings, lengthy titles, lengthy copy, editorial errors, and inappropriate language” (Abstract). Davis further describes that “an extract process is run against the database to create data files containing cable system specific data based on a specified date range and channel map” (Col. 3, lines 55-57). Further, Davis describes that “[t]he data files may be ASCII or tightly packed binary files readable by the cable system to which it is destined” (Col. 3, lines 57-59).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Davis does not provide any explanation describing how the data files are converted into an ASCII format or how the data files are tightly packed into binary files. Rather, Davis generally and conclusory states that the data files may be in such formats without including any additional detail. Accordingly, it logically follows that Davis then cannot teach or suggest “compressing electronic program guide (EPG) data using...a character compression technique,...a word compression technique,...and spacing and capitalization rules,” as presently recited in independent Claim 1.

In rejecting Claim 1, the Office Action states that “Applicant argues that Davis fails to teach compressed EPG data (page 28)” (Office Action, p. 2). In response, the Office Action asserts that “[t]he examiner notes that Davis teaches that the program listings may be ASCII or tightly packed binary files which the examiner equates to

compressed files (see Davis at column 3, lines 57-59)" (Office Action, p. 2). For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner-cited portions of Davis do not teach or suggest the above amended recitations of independent Claim 1. For instance, although Davis describes that data files may be ASCII or tightly packed binary files, Applicant submits that Davis fails to provide any additional description detailing how the data files are converted into an ASCII format or how the data files are tightly packed into binary files. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that Davis does not teach or suggest the above recitations and, therefore, further submits that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Davis.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Nunberg does not remedy the deficiencies in Davis set forth above with respect to Claim 1, nor does the Office Action make any assertions to that effect. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Davis and Nunberg, both singularly and in combination.

Independent Claims 5, 9, 31, 35, and 51

The combination of Davis and Nunberg fails to teach or suggest each element of independent Claims 5, 9, 31, 35, and 51 for at least the reasoning presented above with respect to independent Claim 1 to the extent that Claims 1, 5, 9, 31, 35, and 51 recite similar subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 5, 9, 31, 35, and 51 are also patentable over Davis and Nunberg, both singularly and in combination, for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, 34, 36-38, and 52-54

As stated above, independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 31, 35, and 51 are each patentable over Davis in view of Nunberg. Accordingly, dependent Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, 34, 36-38, and 52-54 are also patentable over the above combination of references at least by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 31, 35, and 51, as well as for the additional features that Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, 34, 36-38, and 52-54 recite.

Moreover, with respect to dependent Claim 3, the Office Action states that “[t]he Examiner takes official notice that automatic spacing which places spaces between characters that reference a letter or a number is well known in the art” and that “[a]utomatic parsing systems which check these character values and insert spaces provide an aesthetically pleasing experience and increases readability and reduces confusion for the reader” (Office Action, p. 6). Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the official notice. For instance, as the currently cited references do not teach or suggest such a feature, Applicant respectfully submits that “automatic spacing which places spaces between characters that reference a letter or a number,” as stated in the Office Action, is not well known in the art. Moreover, Applicant respectfully notes that the Office Action does not support its assertion with any evidence, whether it be documentary support or otherwise. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide documents supporting the assertion of official notice.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-12, 31, 34-38, and 51-54 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and issuance of a notice of allowance. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Brett J. Schlameus/
Brett J. Schlameus
(brett@leehayes.com; 206-876-6022)
Registration No. 60827

Dated: 8/1/2010

Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35061